

Appendices

- A. Definitions
- B. Rivers With Special Protection Zoning
- C. Land Use Regulation Commission's Lake Management Program
- D. LURC Permitting Statistics
- E. Land Use Regulation Commission's Policies Concerning Deer Yard Issues
- F. Plantations and Towns in the Jurisdiction
- G. Fastest Growing Communities in LURC Jurisdiction, 1971-91
- H. Sources

Appendix A

Definitions

The following definitions apply to the following terms as they appear in this Plan (see Chapter 10 of the Commission's regulations and 12 MRSA, Section 682 for complete list of terms defined by rule or law):

Access:

The ability to travel to a specific area on foot or by vehicle. "Public access" is the ability for the public to reach areas within the Commission's jurisdiction on foot or by vehicle. By Maine law, anyone on foot has a right of access over unimproved land to great ponds.

Biodiversity:

The variety of life in all its forms, from the level of the gene to the species, to whole ecosystems including all the ways which these forms interact.

Commercial Sporting Camp:

"A building or group of buildings devoted primarily to the offering of lodging facilities for a fee to persons primarily in pursuit of primitive recreation or snowmobiling". [10.02, 13 of the Commission's regulations]

This term is further defined as primarily a destination facility for the above activities rather than a transient lodging facility or a base of operations for activities in another specific location such as whitewater rafting. A sporting camp may typically consist of, but not necessarily include all of the following: a number of cabins for the housing of guests, a main lodge for serving of meals and socializing for the guests, outbuildings for housing of the owners, guides, and other workers, workshop, woodsheds, laundry, equipment storage, and other utility buildings as needed. Total gross floor area should generally not exceed 10,000 square feet for all structures associated with such a facility.

Fringe:

Those towns, plantations, or townships within the Commission's jurisdiction which are contiguous with Maine towns which have local land use control.

Multiple use:

The judicious management of all the various resources for timber production, outdoor recreation, watershed protection, fish and wildlife protection, mineral extraction, and other private and public purposes.

Multiple use may involve: (1) different uses of adjacent subareas, (2) alternation through time of different uses on the same area, or (3) more than one use of an area at one time. In the first two methods, direct competition between uses is avoided by alternating them in space and time. Where uses occur in the same space at the same time, conflicts between resource uses may occur. In this case, multiple use is more correctly interpreted as a dominant use with secondary uses integrated insofar as they are compatible.

Primitive Recreation:

"Those types of recreational activities associated with non-motorized travel, including fishing, hiking, hunting, wildlife study and photography, wild crop harvesting, trapping, horseback riding, tent and shelter camping, canoe portaging, cross country skiing, and snowshoeing". [10.02, 63 of the Commission's regulations]

Remote:

Distant from permanently settled areas within Maine.

Remote Camp:

"A dwelling unit consisting of not more than 750 square feet of gross floor area, that is not served by any public utilities, except radio communications." [10.02, 70 of the Commission's regulations]

Remote Campsites:

"Campsites which are not part of commercial campgrounds and which are characterized by their remoteness, limited scale, dispersed nature, and limited usage. More specifically, remote campsites include sites which:

- a. are designed to be accessible and generally are only accessible by water or on foot;
- b. are comprised of not more than four individual camping areas designed for separate camping parties, and are designed for a total of not more than 12 overnight campers;
- c. have permanent structures limited to privies, fireplaces or fire rings, picnic tables, and picnic table shelters consisting of a roof without walls; and
- d. require no other construction or grading and only minimal clearing of trees." [10.02, 71 of the Commission's regulations]

Traditional:

Conforming to customs which have passed from generation to generation.

Wilderness:

As defined by the National Wilderness Act of 1964, "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." Little of the Commission's jurisdiction falls within this definition.

Wildlands:

A term which has commonly been used to describe the Commission's jurisdiction. A term which is not synonymous with wilderness nor is it intended to imply that the area is not under active forest management

Appendix B

Rivers with Special Protection Zoning

RECREATION PROTECTION ZONE (P-RR)
(usually, a 250-foot wide zone along each shore)

Allagash River: *Twin Brooks to Churchill Dam*

- Musquacook Stream: *Allagash River to Third Musquacook Lake*
- Chemquasabamticook Stream: *Long Lake to Ross Lake*
- Allagash Stream: *Chamberlain Lake to South Branch*

Aroostook River: *East boundary of T09 R07 WELS to Millinocket Stream*

- Big Machias River: *East boundary of T11 R07 WELS to Millinocket Stream*
- Millinocket Stream: *Aroostook River to Millinocket Lake*
- Munsungan Stream: *Aroostook River to Little Munsungan Lake*
- St. Croix Stream: *Masardis town line to Hall Brook*

Dead River: *Kennebec River to upstream end of Big Eddy*

Dennys River: *Edmunds Village to Township 14/Cooper boundary (south and west shore only)*

East Machias River: *Sections in T18 ED, T19 ED and Township 14, including Maine River*

Kennebec River, Upper: *0.5 mile above Dead River to Harris Dam*

Machias River: *Northfield town line to Fifth Machias Lake, including Fourth and Fifth Lake Streams*

- Old Stream: *Sections in T25 MD, T31 MD, and T37 MD to First Lake*
- Mopang Stream: *Machias River to Mopang Lake*
- West Branch: *Machias River to Lower Sabao Lake*

Moose River: *Attean Pond to Number One Brook*

- Holeb Stream: *Moose River to Holeb Pond*

Narraguagus River: *Beddington town line to Eagle Lake*

Penobscot River, East Branch: *East Millinocket town line to Mattagamon Road, excluding sections zoned P-RP and east shore below Grindstone Falls*

- Sebeois River: *Penobscot River to Snowshoe Lake*
- Wassataquoik Stream: *Penobscot River to Baxter State Park*
- Webster Brook: *Baxter State Park to below Telos Dam*
- Sawtelle Brook: *Sebeois River to Sawtelle Deadwater*

Penobscot River, West Branch: *Approximately Ragmuff Stream to Moosehorn Stream in T04 R14 WELS and Chesuncook Lake to east boundary of T05 R14 WELS*

Pleasant River: *Columbia town line to Beddington town line*

St. John River:

- Big Black River: *St. John River to Canadian border*
- Northwest Branch: *St. John River to Canadian border*
- Southwest Branch: *St. John River to five miles downstream of Canadian border*

West Branch Pleasant River: *Brownville town line to second West Branch Pond, excluding developed areas at Katahdin Iron Works and Little Lyford Pond Camps*

RESOURCE PLAN ZONE (P-RP)

(500 feet wide along each shore of the Penobscot, 250 feet wide along each shore of the St. John)

Penobscot River, East Branch: *Section in T05 R08 WELS and a section in T01 R07 WELS from B&A Railroad downstream 1.125 miles*

Penobscot River, Lower West Branch: *Ambejejus Lake to 400 feet below Ripogenus Dam*

Penobscot River, Upper West Branch: *East boundary of T05 R14 WELS to 400 feet below Seboomook Dam, excluding section zoned P-RR in T04 R14 WELS*

- **Lobster Stream: *Penobscot River to Lobster Lake (plus 9.4 miles of lakeshore on Lobster Lake)***

St. John River: *Allagash town line to Baker Branch*

- **Baker Branch: *St. John River to 400 feet below Baker Branch Bridge***

SPECIAL RIVER TRANSITION PROTECTION ZONE (P-RT)

(250 feet wide)

Aroostook River: *Section in Oxbow Plantation, T10 R06 WELS and T09 R05 WELS*

Big Machias River: *Section in Garfield Plantation*

Appendix C

Land Use Regulation Commission's Lake Management Program

In June of 1990, the Land Use Regulation Commission amended its 1983 *Comprehensive Land Use Plan* by adopting a document entitled, *Amendment of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Regarding the Development and Conservation of Lakes in Maine's Unorganized Areas*. Concurrently, it adopted changes to its *Land Use Districts and Standards* which implemented several components of the comprehensive lake management program presented in the *Plan Amendment*.

Major features of the Commission's 1990 lake management program are reflected in the Water Resources section of this Plan, but some of the background information and other important details were too lengthy to include in the body of this plan. Because of the importance of this planning effort, the entire text of the original *Amendment* is reproduced here with appropriate changes to update the text. The Commission reaffirms its commitment to its lake management program as summarized in the Water Resources section and detailed below, and it will continue to follow the guidance provided below in managing the lake resources in its jurisdiction.

I. Purpose of Amendment

This amendment to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan incorporated two major planning initiatives undertaken by the Commission - the Wildland Lakes Assessment and Lakes Action Program - as well as more current information regarding the relationship between land use and water quality.

II. Lake Issues

The unorganized territories are host to a wealth of lake resources unparalleled in most regions of the nation. These lakes have long been a magnet for sportsmen and outdoor enthusiasts. In recent years, demand for recreational property has grown substantially throughout the northeastern United States. Land costs along Maine's coast have increased dramatically and lake-front properties in areas near population centers have in many cases become saturated with recreational camp development. Seeking both affordable property and a less crowded atmosphere, many people desiring to purchase waterfront property have turned their attention to the recreational opportunities offered by lakes in Maine's unorganized territories.

The current demand for development on lake shorelands within Maine's unorganized areas is unprecedented. At virtually every Commission meeting, the Commission considers one or more issues relating to lakes and lake shorelands. Typical development proposals include those for new residences or additions to existing structures, docks and related recreational facilities, subdivisions, and roads. All told, between 1986 and 1988, approximately one-third of all building and development permit applications within the jurisdiction involved lakes. Subdivision applications appear to be even more heavily weighted toward lakes; upwards of fifty percent of all subdivision applications over the past three years involved areas adjacent to lakes. With its expansion both in volume and distribution, lakeshore development has significant potential to affect important natural values, timber harvesting, and traditional uses associated with lakes, such as sporting camps, in the unorganized territories.

While there seems to be interest in shoreland development on lakes throughout the jurisdiction, there is a trend toward development on medium- to large-sized lakes located near organized townships. In the early 1980's, development attention focuses on three main areas: the Rangeley Lakes, the Moosehead Lake region, and the Pemadumcook/Twin Lakes region. In northern Maine, interest in camp development is also evident in the Square, Cross, and Long Lakes region.

While some of the development proposals brought before the Commission are straightforward and non-controversial, an increasing number involve issues that are not easily resolved. Difficult issues that continually confront the Commission include:

- Camp development on undeveloped lakes;
- Increased vehicle access to undeveloped, backcountry lakes;
- Subdivision development on larger lakes with significant natural, scenic, and recreational values;
- Protection of significant natural resource features outside of designated protection zones;
- Continued development on heavily developed lakes or on lakes with potential water quality problems; and
- Development of private recreational facilities such as docks and access roads where these already exist at other locations on the lake.

The Commission has at its disposal a variety of tools that can be used to regulate use of lake shorelands. These include protective zoning for sensitive areas and code requirements governing setbacks, road construction, timber harvesting, and subdivision of land. While these tools have proved sufficient to manage individual developments, they do not provide the means to effectively plan for the future of these lakes.

Due in part to their numbers, and in part to their remote locations, little information has been available for most lakes in the unorganized territories. This lack of information, and the inadequacy of the existing regulatory framework to deal wisely and comprehensively with lakeshore development, was noted in the 1983 Comprehensive Plan. In fact, the plan highlighted lake protection issues as needing further consideration.

The Commission has always made a special effort to provide for shoreland development while maintaining protection of significant natural values. Nonetheless, in the mid-1980s, faced with the increasing demand for lakefront property, the Commission acknowledged the danger that, even with minimum standards, lakes in its jurisdiction might, by attrition, lose the very character that makes them so unique. In evaluating its lake management goals, the Commission identified five basic needs: 1) the need for additional protection for lakes with exceptional values; 2) the need for a mechanism to guide lakeshore development toward lakes best suited to accommodate it; 3) the need for consistent, reliable, and readily accessible natural resource and land use information; 4) the need for a clearly stated lakes policy; and, 5) the need for a coordinated program to implement this policy.

The Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment and Lakes Action Program were initiated to meet these needs. In undertaking these initiatives, the Commission acknowledged that it had not yet "fulfilled all of its responsibilities to assure that the public interest in these unusual resources is protected" (Maine Wildland Lakes Assessment Work Plan, 1986).

III. Summary of Lake Planning Efforts

A. Wildland Lakes Assessment

The Maine Wildland Lakes Assessment was initiated in 1986 to establish a systematic base of natural resource and land use information on all lakes within the Commission's jurisdiction. The study considered all lakes with a surface area of ten acres or more. Approximately 1500 lakes met this size requirement. Smaller lakes were added when these were found to possess especially noteworthy natural resource values.

Based on methods presented in the Maine Wildland Lakes Assessment Work Plan, information was collected on the following natural resources:

- Fisheries
- Scenic quality
- Botanic features
- Physical resource
- Wildlife
- Shoreline character
- Cultural resources

Lakes that possessed "significant" or "outstanding" resource values in any of these areas were identified, and each lake was placed into one of the following four resource classifications based on its cumulative resource significance:

- Lakes of statewide significance with multiple outstanding natural values, categorized as Resource Class 1A (114 lakes);
- Lakes of statewide significance with a single outstanding natural value, categorized as Resource Class 1B (211 lakes);
- Lakes of regional significance (one or more significant ratings), categorized as Resource Class 2 (577 lakes);
- Lakes of local or unknown significance, categorized as Resource Class 3 (627 lakes).

The study also collected information pertaining to land and water uses, including:

- Access
- Zoning
- Water level fluctuation
- Proximity to services
- Shoreline development
- Ownership
- Public water supply

The completion of the Assessment in June of 1987, served only to highlight the need for further action – to develop measures to protect exceptional resource values associated with lakes and to guide development to the most appropriate areas.

B. Lakes Action Program

Following completion of the Wildland Lakes Assessment, the Commission appointed a Lakes Policy Committee. The committee, which included representatives from major landowners, statewide environmental and sportsmen's organizations, the University of Maine, and the Commission, was charged to:

- 1) Develop a proposal for a policy that might guide future Commission lake management decisions, and
- 2) Identify specific actions that should be taken to implement this proposed policy.

The actions identified by the committee were ultimately consolidated into a proposed lake action program. Public meetings were held in the fall of 1988 to discuss the proposal. *An Action Program for Management of Lakes in Maine's Unorganized Areas* was accepted by the Land Use Regulation Commission in January of 1989.

The Lakes Policy Committee sought a balanced approach to lake conservation and development, and recommended to the Commission a variety of innovative regulatory and non-regulatory lake management techniques, including policy guidance, special review criteria for lake development, lake concept plans, lake management classifications, and other public and private efforts.

C. Other Initiatives

The Commission has recognized the need to update its approach to review of impacts on water quality. To meet this need, Commission staff is working with DEP to develop a systematic approach that more accurately reflects the current level of knowledge about the relationship between land use and lake water quality. Additional rule-making changes will be necessary to implement this approach when it has been finalized.

Understanding of the impacts of clearing and development activities on water quality and riparian habitat has increased dramatically in recent years. In keeping with this improved understanding, IF&W and the Lakes Division of DEP have recommended stronger standards to minimize the impacts of these activi-

ties on water quality and riparian habitat. In response to these recommendations, the Board of Environmental Protection has adopted new standards governing minimum shore frontage, building setback, and clearing for development which will be applied to shoreland in organized towns. To maintain consistent environmental policies throughout the state, the Commission has enacted comparable standards in its jurisdiction.

IV. Policy and Implementation Measures

The Land Use Regulation Commission seeks a balanced and environmentally sound approach to lake conservation and development that:

1. Conserves important lake-related natural resource values;
2. Protects water quality;
3. Accommodates reasonable shoreland development and harvest of timber;
4. Provides a diversity of public recreation opportunities; and
5. Encourages continued use of the unorganized territories for the principal purposes of fiber and food production, non-intensive outdoor recreation, and fisheries and wildlife habitat.

To meet these goals, the Commission will undertake the lake management program outlined below as part of its overall commitment to guide development and resource conservation on the shorelines of the more than 3,000 lakes and ponds in Maine's unorganized areas.

A. Policy Guidance

The Commission will seek a balanced approach to shoreland development and conservation, one which recognizes public and private needs, supports the integrity of large forest holdings, and provides opportunities for creative, non-traditional shoreland development and conservation. The Commission proposes to regulate development based on lake-related natural features and values identified in the Wildlands Lake Assessment, guiding development toward those lakes or lake areas best suited to absorb new development, while restricting use of certain high value lakes. As a general planning guideline, the Commission will seek to ensure that development on lakes will remain below an average of one dwelling unit per 400 feet of shore frontage, and one dwelling unit per ten acres of lake surface area. These guidelines are designed to preserve the natural character of lakes in Maine's unorganized territories and to prevent conflicts between incompatible uses.

B. Review Criteria for Shoreland Permits

The Commission reviews all applications to determine whether they meet statutory criteria regarding technical and financial capability, traffic and circulation, soils, and environmental fit. Of these four decision criteria, "environmental fit" is often the most difficult to assess. In order to increase predictability regarding the assessment of environmental fit, the Commission has identified the following seven areas which it will review as a guide for determining whether adequate provision has been made for fitting subdivisions and commercial, industrial, and other non-residential structures on lakes harmoniously into the existing natural environment. The same review will be applied to rezonings that precede such proposals on lakes.

Natural and cultural resource values: The Commission will utilize the findings of the Wildland Lakes Assessment and other information sources in evaluating the merits of lake-related development. The Commission will, at a minimum, specifically consider all natural resource values that received a rating of either "significant" or "outstanding" in the Assessment, and will look for a demonstration that these values will be maintained.

Water quality: The Commission will give specific consideration to the effect that a proposed development will have on lake water quality. For proposed development on lakes, the Commission will require a finding regarding the probable effect of the proposed action on lake water quality. In those instances where it is determined that an unacceptable increase in phosphorus concentration may occur, the applicant will be required to take additional measures to protect lake water quality. If unacceptable water quality degradation will result regardless of additional measures, the Commission will deny the application.

Independent of its review of specific proposals, the Commission will initiate actions aimed at refining its approach to evaluating lake water quality. This will include updating its approach to identification of water quality limiting lakes and switching to a one part per billion change in phosphorus concentration as an indicator of unacceptable water quality degradation, consistent with DEP's policy for the rest of the state.

Traditional uses: The Commission will consider the effect of lake-related development proposals on traditional uses, including non-intensive public recreation, sporting camp operations, timber harvesting, and agriculture, and will seek to ensure that such proposals do not have an undue adverse effect on these uses.

Regional diversity: The Commission will consider lake-related development proposals in a regional context. The objective will be to determine the effect of substantial land use changes on the diversity of lake-related uses afforded in any region of the jurisdiction. The Commission will make this determination based on a summary of existing lake shoreland uses in the region of the State where the proposed development will be located. The region is considered to be either the township in which the development will be located and the eight townships which abut that township, or, all townships abutting the lake in question, whichever is larger.

Natural character: The Commission will seek to maintain the natural character of lakes by encouraging: visual screening of larger developments and non-conforming structures; consolidated use of recreation facilities such as boat docks and access ramps; and provisions for long-term protection of undeveloped shoreland as part of subdivisions and commercial, industrial, and other non-residential proposals.

Independent of its review of specific proposals, the Commission will adopt stronger shore frontage, setback, and clearing standards in order to maintain the natural character of lake shorelines in the jurisdiction.

Lake management goals: In reviewing development proposals on or near lakes which fall into one of the Commission's seven lake management classifications, the Commission will seek to ensure that the proposed activity is consistent with the stated management intent for that class of lake.

Landowner equity: In certain instances, the amount of future development along a given lake's shoreline may need to be restricted due to water quality or other limitations. This can potentially cause an equity problem in that a landowner not wishing to develop his or her land in the short term could be precluded from developing at a later date due to heavy development on other parcels.

A landowner should not be penalized for voluntarily foregoing early development on lakes where development is otherwise allowed. In cases where future development may be restricted, each landowner should be allotted a percentage of allowable future development proportionate to the extent of his or her ownership. Where a landowner proposes to exceed this proportion, development rights should be acquired from other landowners.

C. Lake Concept Plans

The Commission establishes the "lake concept plan" as a flexible alternative to traditional shoreland regulation, designed to accomplish both public and private objectives. Lake concept plans are landowner-created, long-range plans for the development and conservation of a large block of shoreland on a lake or group of lakes. The plan is a clarification of long-term landowner intent that indicates, in a general way, the areas where development is to be focused, the relative density of proposed development, and the means by which significant natural and recreational resources are to be protected. A concept plan does not require the detailed technical information associated with a site-specific development plan and does not take the place of such plans.

A lake concept plan can be prepared for a lake, a portion of a lake, or a group of lakes. The plan is initiated by the landowner or landowners and must be approved by the Commission.

The goal of concept planning is to encourage long-range planning based on resource characteristics and suitability as an alternative to haphazard, incremental development. The planning process necessary to prepare a plan encourages landowners to chart the future of their lake shorelands in a manner that is thoughtful and forward-looking. The landowner gains from the insight obtained in preparing the plan, from expanded flexibility in making land management decisions, and from increased predictability regarding Commission actions. The public gains from the improved planning that results from comprehensive evaluation of lake-related recreational and natural resources, from provisions for the long-term protection of resources, from greater knowledge of future development patterns, and from the increased predictability of the development review process.

While concept plans are voluntary, initiated and prepared by the landowner, once approved by the Commission, they are binding. The Commission encourages the use of concept plans by its commitment to expedite the permitting process for approved plans and to consider adjusting certain standards, such as the adjacency criterion, provided any such relaxation is matched by comparable conservation measures. Concept plans may not be used to relax requirements associated with Management Class 1 or Class 6 lakes. A concept plan may be used to seek a variation of the density standard for Class 2 lakes. Such variation will be granted only where it can be demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that the plan is fully protective of the lake's special values and is consistent with the Commission's management intent for the lake.

Basic requirements

A concept plan must be responsive to the Commission's policy guidelines for management of lakes in Maine's unorganized areas, give consideration to natural and cultural values identified in the Wildland Lakes Assessment, and be responsive to the Commission's intent to protect those lakes identified in the Maine Wildland Lakes Assessment as warranting special management consideration.

In general, a plan should identify: 1) all areas where new, lake-related development is to be located; 2) resource values or shoreland areas that are to be protected; 3) mechanisms that will be used to conserve important resources or areas; and 4) the life span of the plan.

The emphasis and level of detail of a plan may vary depending on whether the plan is proposed for a single lake, a cluster of lakes, or an entire large ownership. At the option of the plan preparer, a detailed description of one or more development proposals may be submitted as a component of the plan.

Public input

Plan preparers are encouraged to provide avenues for interested parties to offer input during the development of the plan. The Commission will provide opportunity for public review of proposed plans. Notice that the Commission has received a proposal for a concept plan will be given to interested parties including affected landowners and a public review and comment period will be established. Upon request by five or more people, or when desired by the Commission, a public hearing will be held.

Plan approval

Concept plans will be implemented through the Resource Plan Protection Subdistrict (P-RP). In order to approve a concept plan, the Commission must find that the proposed plan conforms with the Commission's lake policies and lake program guidelines, is feasible, and is compatible with other public and private interests. It must also find that the plan strikes a reasonable and publicly beneficial balance between development and conservation of lake resources, and that, taken as a whole, the plan is at least as protective of the natural environment as the development, management, and protection subdistricts which it affects.

When a plan has been approved, the concept plan will be incorporated into the Commission's regulatory framework through appropriate changes to existing zoning. To accomplish the comprehensive planning objective of concept plans, the width of zones should generally be designed to encompass all lake-related development planned for the area over the life of the concept plan, or 500 feet, whichever is more.

Plan amendment and termination

A time span for each plan will be established. Ten years will be the minimum period, but concept plans of less than twenty years duration will be discouraged if such plans propose significant deviations from existing standards. A plan may be extended beyond the designated time period upon mutual agreement of the landowner(s) and the Commission.

To adapt to changing circumstances, plans can be amended or terminated at any time subject to mutual agreement between the landowner(s) and the Commission and following public notice of the proposed Amendment. While proposals for amendment or termination may be initiated by either party, the Commission will be conservative in exercising this option. To ensure good planning, proposals for lake-related development proximate to a lake covered by a concept plan should be pursued through an Amendment to the concept plan. Amendments must be consistent with the intent of the original plan.

To maximize predictability, the plan shall stipulate all conditions associated with termination of the plan, such as the status of any development that was approved as part of the plan but was not initiated during the life of the plan. Upon the plan's termination, the Commission will, in conformity with its comprehensive plan, statutes, and standards, designate appropriate zoning which is consistent with zoning of equivalent areas. Any development or relaxation of regulations which took place as part of a concept plan cannot be used to justify subsequent rezonings, meet adjacency requirements, or otherwise alter zoning at any time in the future.

In the event that a plan is terminated, all transactions initiated as a component of the plan, such as the granting of conservation easements or creation of restrictive covenants on subdivided lands, will continue to apply to the extent that they are covered by legal contract or deeded covenants.

D. Lake Management Classes

The Commission recognizes six specific lake classifications for special planning and management purposes. Lakes are classified based on natural and other resource values and land use characteristics identified in the Wildland Lakes Assessment. Specific descriptions of the criteria for each classification, as well as lists of the lakes in Management Classes 1 through 6, can be found below. Those lakes which are not included in one of these six classes are considered to be Management Class 7.

Management Class 1 lakes are high value, least accessible, undeveloped lakes. It is the Commission's goal to preserve the best examples of these pristine lakes in their natural state by prohibiting development within 1/4 mile of their shores and restricting permanent vehicular access to these lakes. Existing timber harvesting standards are currently considered sufficient to protect the values associated with these lakes from forest management activities. A number of lakes that meet the criteria for Management Class 1 are not designated as such because they are already protected through remote pond zoning. These lakes are identified below.

Management Class 2 lakes are high value, accessible, undeveloped lakes. The Commission intends to conserve the special values of these lakes by significantly restricting the density and intensity of development to one development unit per mile of shoreline. These restrictions will be applied to the area within 500 feet of the lakeshore to enable the Commission to regulate back lot development which could affect the lake's special values and is consistent with the management intent of the lake. Variation of density requirements may only be sought as part of a concept plan which is demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence to be fully protective of the special values associated with the lake.

Management Class 3 lakes are those lakes identified in the Appendix considered by the Commission to be potentially suitable for development based on available information on water quality, access, conflicting uses, shoreland availability, water level fluctuation, location, regional considerations, and special planning needs. Soils were not considered in the designation of these lakes due to lack of information, and may affect the appropriateness of this designation for some lakes. The Commission supports additional responsible development around Class 3 lakes, yet will take care to ensure that their significant natural resource values are conserved. The Commission will waive the adjacency criterion for development proposals on these lakes provided it can be demonstrated to its satisfaction by clear and convincing evidence that the lake has no existing or potential water quality problems and that soils are suitable for development. This waiver is strictly limited to shoreland, and proximate areas may not subsequently use shoreland development on Class 3 lakes to meet the adjacency criterion.

Management Class 4 lakes are high value, developed lakes. The Commission's goal for these lakes is to allow a reasonable level of residential and recreational development while conserving natural resource values and maintaining undeveloped shoreland areas. The Commission will take special care in evaluating and regulating new subdivisions proposed on these lakes and will require cluster development to protect natural values except where clearly inappropriate due to site characteristics.

Management Class 5 consists of heavily developed lakes. The Commission seeks to maintain natural qualities associated with these lakes, enhance scenic values, and retain some undeveloped shoreline by requiring cluster development on these lakes except where clearly inappropriate due to site characteristics. The Commission has identified lakes approaching heavily developed status and will pursue similar goals on the lakes.

Management Class 6 lakes are remote ponds — inaccessible, undeveloped lakes with coldwater game fisheries. The Commission intends to continue to prohibit development within 1/2 mile of these ponds to protect the primitive recreational experience and coldwater lake fisheries in remote settings.

Management Class 7 consists of all lakes not otherwise classified, including many lakes which have multiple outstanding or significant resource values identified in the Wildland Lakes Assessment. The Commission will manage these lakes for multiple use, including resource conservation, recreation, and timber production, giving specific consideration to identified resource values when evaluating the merits of lake-related rezoning and permit applications. It is the Commission's intention that the majority of these lakes remain in Management Class 7 and be managed under applicable requirements.

The Commission will consider reclassification of lakes within certain prescribed limitations. In cases where clear evidence of factual error indicates that a lake was misclassified, it will be reclassified to the appropriate class. Notwithstanding the above, changes in land use characteristics that occur after November 17, 1988, including without limitation, vehicle access and residential development will not be considered in future reclassifications. It is the Commission's intent to hold public hearings on all rule-making proposals involving proposed reclassifications.

The Commission has found that, in a few special cases, Management Class 3 criteria are not sufficiently refined for properly managing large lakes that are appropriate for a mix of conservation and development and which are or are likely to be under intensive development pressure. Moosehead Lake and the Rangeley Lakes, specifically Azizcohos, Mooselookmeguntic, and Upper and Lower Richardson, are considered to be such special cases. These lakes will be placed in Management Class 7 until comprehensive plans are developed to more specifically guide future growth in these areas. The Commission envisions that such plans will be substantially complete within 5 years.

Some lakes classified in Management Classes 1 through 6 abut other jurisdictions - either organized towns or Canada. The Commission should work cooperatively with other jurisdictions fronting on these lakes and encourage them to develop programs that are compatible with and comparable to LURC's lake management program. If comparable regulations are not implemented by abutting jurisdictions within a reasonable period of time, the Commission may choose to reconsider affected lakes' classification.

E. Other Public and Private Initiatives

The Commission encourages state agencies, landowners, and others to undertake actions that are consistent with and supportive of the Commission's lake management goals. Toward this end, the Commission: encourages interagency cooperation and coordination that furthers its lake management program; encourages non-regulatory measures that promote long-term conservation of important lake areas; supports measures to provide incentives for landowner conservation of important natural resources such as lake shorelands; and, encourages responsible shoreland use through campowner education programs.

V. Periodic Update of Lake Management Program

It is the Commission's intention that its lake management program be updated periodically to ensure that it responds to changing needs in a comprehensive manner. To maintain consistency of policy, this review and update should occur concurrent with the periodic revision of the Comprehensive Plan and as needed to address changing circumstances and new trends.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 1

High value, least accessible, undeveloped lakes¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
		TOWN NAME ²		E	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
BAY P (WEST)	4396	T07 SD	249		O					
BOGUS MEADOW P	4380	T07 SD	26	S	O	S				
CARIBOU P (BIG)	4142	T07 R10 WELS	64	S		S	S	O		
DEBOULLIE L	1512	T15 R09 WELS	262	O	O	O	S			
DEBSCONEAG DEADWATER	2076	T02 R10 WELS	500	O	O	-				S
DEBSCONEAG L (1ST)	2060	T02 R10 WELS	320	O	-	O	S	O		S
DEBSCONEAG L (3RD)	0584	T01 R10 WELS	1011	O	-	O	S		S	S
ENCHANTED P	0150	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	330	O	O	O	O			S
GREAT WORKS P	1386	EDMUNDS TWP	50	S	O					
HOBART BOG	7451	EDMUNDS TWP	30	S	O					
HUDSON P (UPPER)	1928	T11 R10 WELS	32	O		O	-			
JERRY P	2190	T05 R07 WELS	272	S		O	S			-
JO-MARY L (LOWER)	0984	T01 R10 WELS	1910	S		O			S	S
JONES P	0172	WYMAN TWP	36		O					
KATAHDIN L	2016	T03 R08 WELS	717	S	-	O	O		S	S
LOGAN P # 2	2082	T02 R09 WELS	20	-		O	S			
MARBLE P	2186	T05 R08 WELS	75	S		S	S	O		O
MATHEWS P	2836	T08 R10 WELS	19	O						
MILLIMAGASSETT L	3004	T07 R08 WELS	1410	S	O					
MOCCASIN P	1590	T14 R08 WELS	32	O	-				-	
NORTH P	9781	T14 R09 WELS	15	O			-		S	
PASSAMAGAMET L	0970	T01 R09 WELS	461	-	-	S	S	O	-	-
POLAND P (UPPER)	PPUP	T07 R14 WELS	245	S	O	O	S	-		O
RAINBOW L	0614	RAINBOW TWP	1684	O	-	O	O			S
REED P (BIG)	2842	T08 R10 WELS	90	O			-	O		
ROUND P (LITTLE)	2874	EAGLE LAKE TWP	58	O	S					O
SAWTELLE P	3008	T07 R08 WELS	174	-	O					
SAWTELLE P (LITTLE)	5778	T07 R08 WELS	10	-	O					
THE HORNS POND	8601	WYMAN TWP	10	S		O	O			

¹CRITERIA: not accessible within 1/4 mile by 2wd; less than 1 development unit per mile; at least one outstanding resource value.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

STATISTICS:

	NUMBER:	29 lakes	% OF TOTAL
	ACRES:	10,092 ac total (ave 348)	1.0%
	SHOREFRONT:	703,492 ft total (ave 24,258)	1.5%
			2.0%

Lakes Meeting Criteria of Management Class 1
But Adequately Protected by Remote Pond Zoning (Mgmt. Class 6)

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL	SIZE(AC)	E	RESOURCE RATINGS						
		TOWN NAME			W	SC	SH	B	C	P	
BLACK L	1506	T15 R09 WELS	147	O							
BRANCH P (MIDDLE)	0912	T05 R09 NWP	34	O							
CEDAR P	0474	TB R10 WELS	65	O							S
CHAIRBACK P (WEST)	0796	T07 R09 NWP	47	O							S
CLEARWATER P	2692	ATTEAN TWP	34			.				O	
CURRIER P (FIRST)	2768	T09 R11 WELS	20	O		S					
CURRIER P (SECOND)	2774	T09 R11 WELS	28	O							
DIXON P	9911	PIERCE POND TWP	17	O							
ENCHANTED P (LITTLE)	0148	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	35	O							
FOWLER P	0686	T03 R11 WELS	19	S		O	S				
GARDNER L	1528	T15 R09 WELS	288	O	O	O					
GAUNTLET P	0472	TB R10 WELS	11	S	.	O					
GREEN MTN P	3666	T06 R06 WELS	10	O							
HARRINGTON P	0702	T03 R11 WELS	40	m		O					
HELEN P	0094	PIERCE POND TWP	15	O							
HIGH P	0092	PIERCE POND TWP	7	O		.	.				
HORSERACE PONDS	0626	RAINBOW TWP	50	O		O	S				O
HURD P (LITTLE)	0596	T02 R10 WELS	60	S		O	S				S
IRELAND P	4168	T07 R08 WELS	30	O							
LANE P	2490	COMSTOCK TWP	24	S							O
LANG P	2542	PARLIN POND TWP	30	O							
LANG P (LITTLE)	2543	PARLIN POND TWP	13	O			.				
LONG P (LITTLE)	4424	T10 SD	55	S		O	S				
LOON P	2688	ATTEAN TWP	37	O							
MARY PETUCHE P	2474	PRENTISS TWP	10	S		.	.				O
MCKENNA P	0688	T03 R11 WELS	53	m		O	S				
MINISTER P (BIG)	0590	T02 R10 WELS	15	O							
RAINBOW DEADWATERS	9698	RAINBOW TWP	58	O		.					
ROACH P (FOURTH)	0446	SHAWTOWN TWP	266	S		O	S				
SLAUGHTER P	0690	T03 R11 WELS	66	O		O	S		S	.	
SPRUCE MOUNTAIN P	0466	TB R11 WELS	20	S		O	.				S
SQUAW P (BIG)	0334	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	91	O		.					S
SQUAW P (LITTLE)	0336	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	25	O							S
SWIFT RIVER P (LIT)	3572	TOWNSHIP E	15	O			.				
TOBEY P #1	2674	T05 R07 BKP WKR	35	m		O	S	.			
TROUT P	3260	MASON TWP	17	m		S			O		
TURTLE P	0952	LAKE VIEW PLT	81	O		.		.			
TWIN (TROUT) PONDS	2102	T02 R09 WELS	60	O		O	S				.
WADLEIGH P (LITTLE)	2974	T08 R15 WELS	15	m		.	.				O

*Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 2

Especially high value, accessible, undeveloped lakes¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
		TOWN NAME ²		E	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
ALLAGASH L	9787	T08 R14 WELS	4260	O	O	O	O	-	S	O
ALLIGATOR L	4498	T34 MD	1159	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
ATTEAN P	2682	ATTEAN TWP	2745	O	-	O	O	O	-	O
BALD MOUNTAIN P	0314	BALD MTN TWP T2R3	1152	O	O	O	O	-	-	-
BEAVER P	3310	MAGALLOWAY PLT	179	O	O	-	-	-	-	-
BENSON P (BIG)	0864	T07 R09 NWP	320	O	-	O	-	-	S	-
CAUCOMGOMOC L	4012	T06 R14 WELS	5081	O	O	S	S	-	S	O
CHAIN OF PONDS	5064	CHAIN OF PONDS TWP	700	O	O	O	S	-	S	O
CHESUNCOOK L ⁴	CHCH	T03 R12 WELS	18470	O	O	-	-	O	O	O
CHURCHILL L	2856	T09 R12 WELS	2923	O	O	-	-	-	S	S
CLEAR L	1938	T10 R11 WELS	614	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
CLIFF L	2780	T09 T12 WELS	563	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
CROSBY P	3330	COBURN GORE	150	O	S	O	-	-	-	-
EAGLE L (BIG)	2858	EAGLE LAKE TWP	8288	O	O	-	-	O	O	P
FLAGSTAFF L	0038	DEAD RIVER TWP	20300	O	O	S	S	-	-	-
IRONBOUND P	2510	ALDER BROOK TWP	40	O	-	O	O	-	-	O
JACKSON P # 2	0704	T03 R11 WELS	12	S	-	O	O	-	-	-
JIM P	5054	JIM POND TWP	320	O	O	O	S	-	-	-
JO-MARY L (UPPER)	0243	TA R10 WELS	1873	O	-	O	S	-	-	S
LOBSTER L	2948	LOBSTER TWP	3475	O	O	O	O	O	S	O
LONG L	1892	T12 R13 WELS	1203	O	O	-	-	-	S	S
MACHIAS L (THIRD)	1124	T42 MD BPP	2778	O	O	-	-	-	S	-
MOOSELEUK L	1990	T10 R09 WELS	422	S	O	O	-	-	O	-
MUNSUNGAN L	4180	T08 R10 WELS	1415	O	-	O	S	-	O	-
MUSQUASH L (WEST)	1096	T06 R01 NBPP	1613	O	-	O	S	-	S	-
NAHMAKANTA L	0698	T01 R11 WELS	1024	O	-	O	O	O	S	-
PENOBSCOT L	0339	DOLE BROOK TWP	1019	O	-	O	S	-	S	O
PIERCE P	0086	PIERCE POND TWP	1650	O	S	O	S	-	-	-
PLEASANT L	1100	T06 R01 NBPP	1574	O	-	O	S	O	-	-
ROUND P	1470	T13 R12 WELS	697	O	O	-	-	-	S	-
SCRAGGLY L	4264	T07 R08 WELS	842	O	-	O	O	O	S	O
SPENCER L	5104	HOBBS TOWN TWP	1819	O	-	O	O	O	O	-
SPENCER P	0404	E MIDDLESEX CANAL GR	980	S	O	O	S	-	-	-
TELOS L & ROUND P	2710	T06 R11 WELS	2276	O	S	O	S	-	S	-
TIM P	2362	TIM POND TWP	320	O	-	O	-	-	-	-
UMSASKIS L	1896	T11 R13 WELS	1222	O	O	-	-	-	S	S

¹CRITERIA: accessible to within 1/4 by 2wd; less than 1 development unit per mile; two or more outstanding resource values in fisheries, wildlife, scenic or shore character — outstanding wildlife value must be due to especially concentrated and/or diverse wildlife values.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

⁴Includes Ripogenus Lake, but not Caribou Lake.

STATISTICS:

	NUMBER:	36 lakes	% OF TOTAL
	ACRES:	93,478 ac total (ave 2,596)	13.7%
	SHOREFRONT:	3,313,189 ft total (ave 97,447)	9.8%

MANAGEMENT CLASS 3
Potentially suitable for development¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS						
				E	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
BEAU L	9785	T19 R11 WELS	2003	S	-	-	-	S	S	S
BIG L	1288	NO 21 TWP	10305	O	O	-	-	O	O	
BOWLIN P	2188	T05 R08 WELS	115	S	-	S	-	-	-	
BRANDY P	9651	T39 MD	723	S	O	-	-	-	-	S
BRASSUA L	4120	ROCKWOOD STRIP-East	8979	S	-			-	O	
CARIBOU L	CHCA	T02 R12 WELS	4600	O	O			O	O	O
CHENEY P	2494	HAMMOND TWP	99	S	-			-	-	S
CLAYTON L	1958	T12 R08 WELS	264	S						
EBEEMEE L(UPPER)	0966	T04 R09 NWP	196							S
ENDLESS L	0942	T03 R09 NWP	1499	S					S	S
FALLS P	1490	T18 R10 WELS	256	S	S		-		-	
FISH RIVER L	0009	T13 R08 WELS	2642	S	S	O	S		S	
GLAZIER L	9789	T18 R10 WELS	1120	S	-			S		
GRAHAM L	4350	T08 SD	7865	S	O	-		-	O	
GRAND L (WEST)	1150	T06 ND BPP	14340	O	O	O	O		O	
HORSESHOE P	3336	COBURN GORE	37		S					
INDIAN P	4090	SAPLING TWP	3746	S	O				S	
JO-MARY L(MIDDLE)	0986	T4, INDIAN PURCHASE	1152	S		O	S		S	S
LONG P	2536	LONG POND TWP	3053	S	S	O	S		S	
LONG P	3356	SEVEN PONDS TWP	35	S						
MACHIAS L (BIG)	1960	T12 R08 WELS	692	S	S				S	
MACHIAS L (LITTLE)	1578	NASHVILLE PLT	275	S	S					
MATTAMISCONTIS L (LT)	2138	T03 R09 NWP	275	S						
MATTASEUNK L	3040	MOLUNKUS TWP	576	S						
MUD P	0023	JIM POND TWP	14	S			-			
ONAWA L	0894	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	1344	O	O	O	S		S	-
PEMADUMCOOK CHAIN L	0982	T01 R10 WELS	18300	S		O	S		O	S
POCUMCUS L	1110	T05 ND BPP	2201	O	O				S	
ROACH P (FIRST)	0436	FRENCHTOWN TWP	3270	S		S	S	S	S	
ROCKABEMA L	3636	MORO PLT	339	S		S	S			
ROCKY P	4476	T22 MD	666	m						
ROUND P	1594	T14 R08 WELS	90	S	S		-			
SAPONAC P	4722	GRAND FALLS TWP	922	S	-	S	S		S	P
SCHOODIC L ³	0956	LAKE VIEW PLT	7168	S		S			S	S
SILVER L	0922	KATAHDIN IRN WKS PLT	306	S		S	S			S
SPECTACLE (SPEC) P	4450	OSBORN PLT	1754	O						

¹CRITERIA: see page C-14.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Also on Management Class 5 list.

STATISTICS:

NUMBER:	36 lakes	% OF TOTAL
ACRES:	101,220 ac total (ave 2,812)	1.2%
SHOREFRONT:	3,601,527 ft total (ave 100,042)	14.9%
		10.2%

POTENTIAL MANAGEMENT CLASS 3 LAKES

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ²						
				E	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
MOOSEHEAD L	0390	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	74890	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Official classification of this lake will await completion of study now in progress.

SQUARE L	1672	T16 R05	8150	0					S	S
----------	------	---------	------	---	--	--	--	--	---	---

Square Lake may be placed on this list when and if the Maine Department of Environmental Protection is able to show that increased shoreland development around Square Lake would not significantly contribute to the stresses already being placed on it from lakes upstream.

AZISCOHOS L	3290	LINCOLN PLT	6700	0	0	S	S		0	S
MOOSELOOKMEGUNTIC L	MLML	RICHARDSONTOWN TWP	14101	0	0	S	0		0	
RICHARDSON L (LOWER)	3280	TOWNSHIP C	2900	0	S	S	0		S	
RICHARDSON L (UPPER)	3308	RICHARDSONTOWN TWP	4200	0	0	0	0		0	

These lakes were removed from Management Class 3 based on a recognition that the Rangeley Lakes have special planning needs that are not addressed by this classification. The Rangeley Lakes, comprised of a string of large, high value lakes subject to intensive development pressure, represent a unique resource to the state. Management Class 3 is not considered a sufficiently refined designation to adequately manage and protect these lakes, which like Moosehead, are suited to a mix of development and conservation. These lakes will remain in Management Class 7 until a comprehensive regional plan has been developed to guide future growth.

Criteria for Management Class 3 Lakes

The lakes listed in Management Class 3, also referred to as Potentially Suitable for Development, meet the following criteria:

a. Water quality

- Development of the remaining undeveloped shoreline at the rate of one dwelling unit per 150 feet of frontage will not result in a change in phosphorus concentration of 1 part per billion or more.
- Not having additional lake specific water quality problems that would be exacerbated by additional shoreline development.

b. Location

- Located within two townships of the organized portion of the State or existing settlements with public services.

c. Access

- Accessible by 2-wheel drive motor vehicle during summer months to within 1/4 mile of the normal high water mark of the lake.

d. Conflicting use

- Not totally zoned as P-FW (Fish and Wildlife Protection Subdistrict), P-WL (Wetland Protection Subdistrict), or P-RR (Recreation Protection Subdistrict).
- Not a municipal water supply.
- No major or unavoidable conflict with critical species or habitats.
- No major or unavoidable conflict with recreational activities requiring an undeveloped setting.

e. Available shoreline

- Greater than 10 acres of surface area per existing dwelling unit.
- Undeveloped shore area adequate for 10 or more dwelling units.

Water level fluctuation

- No extreme water level fluctuation (i.e. dam regulated draw down) which makes shoreline unsuitable for development.

g. Regional consideration

- No region of the state is to have all or the great majority of the large water bodies in the area identified as suitable for development; in such cases, certain lakes otherwise eligible will be omitted from the list; preference will be given to retaining lakes which:
 - (1) are the least sensitive to water quality degradation;
 - (2) are closest to paved, all-season roads;
 - (3) are closest to existing development centers;
 - (4) have the least conflict between development and their resource significance.

h. Special planning needs

- Is not a large lake determined by the Commission as having special planning needs, as evidenced by a combination of: suitability for development, high resource value or significance, and intensive development pressure.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 4
 'High value, developed lakes'

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				E	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
ARNOLD P	3332	COBURN GORE	148	S		O	-	-	O	
CARRY P (WEST)	0048	CARRYING PLC TWN TWP	675	O	-	-	-	-	O	-
CATHANCE L	9661	NO 14 TWP	2905	O	O				S	O
CHAIN L (FIRST)	1236	T26 ED BPP	336	O					S	O
CHAIN L (SECOND)	1234	T26 ED BPP	589	O					S	O
CLIFFORD L	1304	T27 ED BPP	954	O	O	-	-		-	
CUPSUPTIC L	MLCU	ADAMSTOWN TWP	2199	O	O	O	S		S	
DONNELL P	4412	T09 SD	112	O	-	O	O		S	
GREENWOOD P (BIG)	0884	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	211	O	-	O	-			
GRAND FALLS FLOWAGE	7437	FOWLER TWP	6691	O	O		-	-		
HOLEB P	2652	HOLEB TWP	1055	S	-	O	O	O	-	
KENNEBAGO L (BIG)	2374	DAVIS TWP	1700	O	O	O	O	-	S	O
LYFORD P (BIG)	0438	SHAWTOWN TWP	152	O		-			O	
NICATOUS L	4766	T40 MD	5165	S	O	O	O	-	S	
POND IN THE RIVER	3328	TOWNSHIP C	512	O	S	S	-	O	-	
RAGGED L	2936	T02 R13 WELS	2712	O	-	O	S	-	S	-
RANGELEY L	3300	RANGELEY PLT	6000	O	S	O	S	S	O	O
SPRING RIVER L	4432	T10 SD	704	S	-	O	O	-		
SYSLADOBSIS L (LO)	4730	T05 ND BPP	5376	S		S	S	O	S	-
TOGUE P (LOWER)	2084	T02 R09 WELS	384	S		O	S	-	-	O
TOGUE P (UPPER)	2104	T02 R09 WELS	294	S	-	O	S		-	O
TUNK L	4434	T10 SD	2010	O	O	O	O		S	S
WILSON P (UPPER)	0410	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	940	S	S	O	S		-	S

¹CRITERIA: two or more outstanding resource values; accessible to within 1/4 mile by 2wd; more than one development unit per mile; not included in management class 3 (potentially suitable for development).

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

STATISTICS:

NUMBER:	23 lakes	% OF TOTAL
ACRES:	42,832 ac total (ave 1,862)	0.7%
SHOREFRONT:	2,035,971 ft total (ave 88,520)	6.3%
		5.7%

MANAGEMENT CLASS 5

Heavily developed lakes¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	EXISTING DENSITY	
				ACRES PER D.U.	FEET PER D.U.
AMBAJEJUS L ³	PAMB	T01 R09 WELS	3289	10.	229.5
BAKER STREAM P	7104	BALD MTN TWP T2R3	12	3.0	1827.
BEAVER MOUNTAIN L	3562	SANDY RIVER PLT	543	4.7	253.6
BEAVER P	3354	SEVEN PONDS TWP	20	3.3	819.8
BOTTLE L	4702	LAKEVILLE PLT	281	3.8	338.0
BOYD L	2158	ORNEVILLE TWP	1005	6.4	358.3
CAMPBELL P	2574	BLAKE GORE	15	5.0	828.3
CEDAR L	2004	T03 R09 NWP	685	7.3	305.9
CROSS L	1674	T17 R05 WELS	2515	8.8	309.2
DAVIS (WAPITI) P	2196	T05 R07 WELS	69	8.6	1186.
DEAD STREAM P	4066	WEST FORKS PLT	67	9.6	1669.
DEER L	4512	T34 MD	38	5.4	861.9
EBEEMEE L	0914	T05 R09 NWP	940	5.8	391.7
FISH P	4054	MOXIE GORE	15	7.5	1973.
HILLS P	3686	PERKINS TWP	22	4.4	973.4
HUTCHINSON P	3494	ALBANY TWP	96	5.6	581.8
KINGSBURY P	0262	MAYFIELD TWP	390	4.3	277.3
KNEELAND P	3266	ALBANY TWP	16	4.0	1086.
LONG (MARTIN) P	4108	THE FORKS PLT	26	3.2	814.7
LONG P	1200	T18 MD BPP	15	7.5	1892.
LOON L	2384	DALLAS	168	2.9	248.0
MADAWASKA L	1802	T16 R04 WELS	1526	4.8	167.4
NUMBER NINE L	1756	T09 R03 WELS	120	5.2	389.4
OTTER P	7142	MAYFIELD TWP	25	2.8	409.4
PAPOOSE P (LITTLE)	3268	ALBANY TWP	19	9.5	2499.
PEEP L	9821	T30 MD BPP	32	8.0	1430.
PENMAN P	0113	T26 ED BPP	29	3.6	543.4
PLEASANT PD	0224	THE FORKS PLT	1120	5.8	180.3
PRESQUE ISLE L	1758	T09 R03 WELS	38	5.4	927.7
PROCTOR P	3210	ALBANY TWP	45	4.1	463.4
ROUND P	3584	TOWNSHIP E	42	7.0	959.2
SANDY RIVER P (MID)	3566	SANDY RIVER PLT	70	8.8	1307.
SANDY RIVER P(LOWER)	3564	SANDY RIVER PLT	17	5.7	1450.
SANDY RIVER P(UPPER)	3568	SANDY RIVER PLT	28	7.0	1289.
SCHOODIC L ³	0956	LAKE VIEW PLT	7168	18.	386.2
SHIN P (LOWER)	2198	T05 R07 WELS	638	4.8	278.4
SMITH P	2012	T3, INDIAN PURCHASE	208	2.2	177.6
SOLDIER P	9783	WALLAGRASS PLT	96	6.9	1213.
SONGO P	3262	ALBANY TWP	224	2.5	201.0
TWIN L (SOUTH) ³	PSTW	T04 INDIAN PURCHASE	3406	14.	388.0
UNNAMED P	7062	THE FORKS PLT	10	3.3	573.7
UNNAMED P	8735	SALEM TWP	40	2.2	481.1
WHETSTONE P	0296	KINGSBURY PLT	256	4.2	263.5

¹CRITERIA: Lakes with less than 10 acres or 400 feet of frontage per dwelling unit taken as an average around entire lake.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Also on Management Class 3 list.

STATISTICS:

	NUMBER:	43 lakes	% OF TOTAL
	ACRES:	25,384 ac total (ave 590)	1.4%
	SHOREFRONT:	999,060 ft total (ave 22,234)	3.7%
			2.8%

(revised 02/01/95 - dropped Redington Pond & Unnamed Pond (7818) due to lack of development per new zoning maps.)

**LAKES APPROACHING
HEAVILY DEVELOPED STATUS¹**

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	EXISTING DENSITY	
				ACRES PER D.U.	FEET PER D.U.
BEAVER P	3588	TOWNSHIP D	20	20	5577
BRANCH P (1ST WEST)	0440	SHAWTOWN TWP	119	15	2021
CARRY P (MIDDLE)	0046	CARRYING PLC TWN TWP	126	16	2381
CARRY P (WEST)	0048	CARRYING PLC TWN TWP	675	16	678.5
CENTER P	4040	SOLDIERTOWN TWP	51	17	2646
CHAIN L (FIRST)	1236	T26 ED BPP	336	15	1133
CHALK P	3270	ALBANY TWP	25	13	2329
CHASE STREAM P	4080	CHASE STREAM TWP	75	19	4386
CUT P	1706	DUDLEY TWP	26	13	3390
DUCK L	4698	LAKEVILLE PLT	256	13	892
ELLIS P	4086	CHASE STREAM TWP	85	17	2161
ENCHANTED P (LOWER)	0142	LOWER ENCHANTED TWP	20	10	6764
ENOCH L	1328	FOWLER TWP	18	18	3291
FISH P	3324	LINCOLN PLT	20	20	6458
GULL P	3532	DALLAS	281	13	704
HATHORN P	4242	T04 R08 WELS	15	15	3264
HUSSEY P	0292	BLANCHARD PLT	15	15	3729
KENNEBAGO L (LITTLE)	3958	STETSONTOWN TWP	190	14	837.4
LONG L	1682	T17 R03 WELS	6000	20	600.4
LONG P	3582	TOWNSHIP E	254	17	1071
LONG P	4118	TAUNTON & RAYNHAM	173	14	1190
LYFORD P (BIG)	0438	SHAWTOWN TWP	152	17	1623
MATTASEUNK L	3040	MOLUNKUS TWP	576	16	1191
MAYFIELD P	0260	MAYFIELD TWP	140	14	1122
MOOSEHEAD L #6	MH06	TOMHEGAN TWP	9925	31	670.8
MOXIE P	4050	EAST MOXIE TWP	2370	14	800.2
MYRICK P	4416	T10 SD	45	15	3007
NORTHWEST P	3342	MASSACHUSETTS GORE	45	15	1986
PARLIN P	2544	PARLIN POND TWP	543	15	929.3
PEPPERPOT P	3298	ADAMSTOWN TWP	50	10	1058
POSSUM P	1310	T26 ED BPP	30	15	2532
PUDDING P	0932	BARNARD TWP	12	12	2657
SABBATH DAY P	3578	TOWNSHIP E	57	11	1547
SAINT CROIX L	1774	ST CROIX TWP	416	18	1402
SAINT FROID L	1610	WINTERVILLE PLT	2400	11	415.3
SECOND L	1134	T37 MD BPP	102	11	1726
SHAW P	5152	T03 R04 BKP WKR	45	15	2814
SILVER L	0922	KATAHDIN IRN WKS TWP	305	17	1581
SPENCER P	3586	TOWNSHIP D	15	15	3538
SPRING RIVER L	4432	T10 SD	704	19	1395
THANKSGIVING P	0288	BLANCHARD PLT	17	17	3873
TROUT P	0322	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	33	17	2628
UNNAMED P	9740	DENNISTOWN PLT	20	20	2615
UNNAMED P	9668	T05 R07 BKP WKR	12	12	8802
UNNAMED P	7314	HIGHLAND PLT	12	12	4074
WALLAGRASS L (THIRD)	1552	ST JOHN PLT	45	11	1509
WEST L	0503	T03 ND	1344	19	794.8
YOKE PONDS	0504	TA R11 WELS	134	11	1808

¹Lakes with less than 20 acres or 1000 feet of frontage per dwelling unit taken as an average around entire lake.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6

Remote ponds¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL	SIZE(AC)	E	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
		TOWN NAME ²			W	SC	SH	B	C	P	
ALLIGATOR P	0502	TA R11 WELS	47	S							
AZISCOHOS P	3106	MAGALLOWAY PL	12	S							
BAKER P	0422	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	10	m							
BEAN P	0656	T02 R12 WELS	16	m	—						
BEAN P (LOWER)	0646	RAINBOW TWP	37	S	S						
BEAN P (MIDDLE)	0648	RAINBOW TWP	10	—	S						—
BEAN P (UPPER)	0650	RAINBOW TWP	25	S	S						S
BEAR BROOK BOG	4020	T06 R15 WELS	15	m	S						
BEAR P*	4018	T06 R15 WELS	138		S	O					
BEAR P	0636	RAINBOW TWP	30	S		—					S
BEATTIE P	5066	BEATTIE TWP	27	S							
BEAVER P	0670	T03 R11 WELS	15	m		S	S				
BEAVER P	0484	SHAWTOWN TWP	27	S		—					
BEAVER P (BIG)	0610	RAINBOW TWP	45	S							
BEAVER P (LITTLE)	9700	RAINBOW TWP	8								
BEAVER P (LITTLE)	0612	T03 R11 WELS	10	m							
BENJAMIN P	2684	ATTEAN TWP	121	m		S	S				
BIRCH RIDGE P # 1	0514	TA R11 WELS	11	S							
BLACK L	1506	T15 R09 WELS	147	O		S					
BLACK P (LITTLE NO)	1508	T15 R09 WELS	6	S		S					
BLACK P (LITTLE SO)	1510	T15 R09 WELS	7	S		S					
BLUFF P	0434	FRENCHTOWN TWP	10	S							S
BLUFFER P (UPPER)	2798	T08 R11 WELS	15	S							
BOARDWAY P (BIG)	0494	TA R11 WELS	15	S							S
BOULDER P	2672	T05 R07 BKP WKR	30	m							
BOWLIN P (LITTLE)	2194	T05 R07 WELS	34	S							
BRACKETT P	0290	BLANCHARD PLT	10	m							
BRANCH P (MIDDLE)	0912	T05 R09 NWP	34	O							
BRAYLEY P	2706	T07 R10 WELS	6								
BUCK P	0644	RAINBOW TWP	6								
CAPE HORN P	2568	PRENTISS TWP	22								
CEDAR P	0474	TB R10 WELS	65	O							S
CEDAR P	2654	HOLEB TWP	5								
CHAIRBACK P (EAST)	0802	T07 R09 NWP	46	S							S
CHAIRBACK P (WEST)	0796	T07 R09 NWP	47	O							S
CHASE STREAM P	4093	MISERY TWP	31	S		—				—	—
CHESUNCOOK P*	0672	T03 R11 WELS	272	S		O	O				O
CLAYTON P	2406	T06 R17 WELS	75	m							
CLEAR P	5074	LOWELLTOWN TWP	21	m						—	
CLEARWATER P	2692	ATTEAN TWP	34	-						O	
CLEARWATER P*	2476	PRENTISS TWP	11								P
CLIFFORD P	0624	RAINBOW TWP	17	S							—
CLISH P	5158	T05 R20 WELS	21	S							
CRANBERRY P(L,NOTCH)	0784	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	7								
CURRIER P (FIRST)	2768	T09 R11 WELS	20	O		S					
CURRIER P (SECOND)	2774	T09 R11 WELS	28	O							
DAISEY P	0594	T02 R10 WELS	11	S							—
DEBSCONEAG P (6TH)	0580	T01 R11 WELS	31	S						S	S
DINGLEY P (LITTLE)	2462	T04 R05 NBKP	17	S							

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6 (con'd)

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME²	SIZE(AC)	F	RESOURCE RATINGS³						P
					W	SC	SH	B	C		
DINGLEY P (UPPER)	2464	T04 R05 NBKP	20	S							
DIPPER P*	4042	PITTSTON ACAD GRANT	13				—		0	S	
DIXON P	9911	PIERCE POND TWP	17	O			—		—	—	
DOUGHNUT P	0616	RAINBOW TWP	12	S							
DUBOIS P	2478	PRENTISS TWP	18	m							P
EDDY P	3546	SANDY RIVER PLT	9								
ENCHANTED P (LITTLE)	0148	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	35	O							
FOGG P	0426	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	23	S							
FOLEY P (LITTLE)	2492	COMSTOCK TWP	35	m		—	—				
FOWLER P	0686	T03 R11 WELS	19	S	—	0	S				
FROST P (LITTLE)	0668	T03 R12 WELS	35	S	S						
GARDNER L	1528	T15 R09 WELS	288	O	0	0					
GAUNTLET P	0472	TB R10 WELS	11	S	—	0					
GORDON P	0146	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	28	S	—	—					
GOULD P	0620	RAINBOW TWP	12	m							
GREEN MTN P	3666	T06 R06 WELS	10	O							
HAFEY P	1498	T18 R11 WELS	23	S							
HALE P	2508	ALDER BROOK TWP	40	m							
HALL P	2566	PRENTISS TWP	19	S							
HALL P	5092	T05 R07 BKP WKR	42	m							
HARRINGTON P	0702	T03 R11 WELS	40	m		0					
HATHORN P	4242	T04 R08 WELS	15	S							
HATHORN P (LITTLE)	2298	T04 R08 WELS	8								
HEDGEHOG P	0556	T01 R11 WELS	5								
HELEN P	0094	PIERCE POND TWP	15	O							
HIGH P	0092	PIERCE POND TWP	7	O							
HOLBROOK P*	0632	RAINBOW TWP	224	S		S	0				
HORSEACE PONDS	0626	RAINBOW TWP	50	O		0	S				0
HORSESHOE P	9277	T16 R09 WELS	15	S							
HORSESHOE P	2686	ATTEAN TWP	50	m							
HOUSTON P (LITTLE)*	0920	KATAHDIN IRN WKS TWP	27	O							S
HURD P (LITTLE)	0596	T02 R10 WELS	60	S		0	S				S
IRELAND P	4168	T07 R08 WELS	30	O							
JACKSON P #1	0684	T03 R11 WELS	23								
JUNIPER KNEE P	0878	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	32	S							
KELLY P	0654	T02 R12 WELS	60	S							
LANE P	2490	COMSTOCK TWP	24	S							0
LANE BROOK P	3664	T06 R06 WELS	33								
LANG P	2542	PARLIN POND TWP	30	O							
LANG P (LITTLE)	2543	PARLIN POND TWP	13	O							
LEDGE P	3554	SANDY RIVER PLT	6								
LINE P	5162	T05 R20 WELS	7								
LONG BOG	2668	HOLEB TWP	19	m							
LONG P	2690	ATTEAN TWP	37	m		—					
LONG P (LITTLE)	4424	T10 SD	55	S		0	S				
LOON P	2688	ATTEAN TWP	37	m							
LOON P	0554	T01 R11 WELS	5								
LOST P	2694	ATTEAN TWP	5								
MARY PETUCHE P	2474	PRENTISS TWP	10	S							0
MCKENNA P	0688	T03 R11 WELS	53	m		0	S				

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6 (con'd)

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL	SIZE(AC)	E	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
		TOWN NAME ²			W	SC	SH	B	C	P	
MCKENNEY P	0154	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	9	—							
MESSER P	4244	T05 R08 WELS	27	S							
MIDWAY P	3544	SANDY RIVER PLT	7								
MINISTER P (BIG)	0590	T02 R10 WELS	15	O							
MINISTER L (LITTLE)	0592	T02 R10 WELS	4								
MOUNTAIN CATCHER P	4258	T06 R08 WELS	84	S							
MOUNTAIN P	0432	BEAVER COVE	56	S							S
MOUNTAIN VIEW P	0488	TA R11 WELS	13	S							
MOXIE P	3585	TOWNSHIP D	6								
MUD P	2340	TOWNSHIP 6 N OF WELD	6								
MURPHY P	0486	TA R11 WELS	12								
MURPHY P (BIG)	0638	RAINBOW TWP	15	S							
MUSCALSEA P (BIG)	4036	RUSSELL POND TWP	14	m		S					
MUSCALSEA P (LITTLE)	4034	RUSSELL POND TWP	11	m							
NOTCH P	0786	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	10	S							
NOTCH P (BIG)	0328	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	12	S							
NOTCH P (LITTLE)	0326	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	10	S							
PAPOOSE P	0338	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	3								
PITMAN P	0598	T02 R10 WELS	20	—							
POLLY P	0692	T03 R11 WELS	15	m							
PORTER P*	4760	T03 ND	58	S							
RABBIT P	0552	T01 R11 WELS	10	m							
RABBIT P	0366	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	10								
RAINBOW P	4436	T10 SD	17								
RAINBOW DEADWATERS	9698	RAINBOW TWP	58	O							
REED P (LITTLE)	2838	T08 R10 WELS	25	m							
RIPOGENUS P	2910	T04 R12 WELS	76	m	S					S	
ROACH P (FOURTH)	0446	SHAWTOWN TWP	266	S	-	O	S				
ROACH P (SEVENTH)	0500	TA R11 WELS	33	S							
ROACH P (SIXTH)	0480	SHAWTOWN TWP	48	S							
ROBAR P (BIG)	2296	T04 R08 WELS	7								
ROBERTS P	5164	T05 R20 WELS	19	m							
ROCKY P (LITTLE)	0524	TA R11 WELS	12	S							
ROUND P	2670	APPLETON TWP	5								
SADDLEBACK P	3550	SANDY RIVER PLT	13	S							
SECRET P	0907	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	12	S						—	
SLAUGHTER P	0690	T03 R11 WELS	66	O		O	S			S	
SNAKE P	2548	JOHNSON MOUNTAIN TWP	8								
SOCATEAN P #1	4044	PLYMOUTH TWP	42	m							
SOCATEAN P #2	4046	PLYMOUTH TWP	14	m							
SPECK P	3288	GRAFTON TWP	9								
SPRING P	2832	T07 R10 WELS	15	O							
SPRUCE MOUNTAIN P	0466	TB R11 WELS	20	S		O					S
SQUAW P (BIG)	0334	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	91	O		-					S
SQUAW P (LITTLE)	0336	LITTLE SQUAW TWP	25	O		-					S
ST JOHN P (SECOND)	2432	T04 R17 WELS	105								
ST JOHN P (THIRD)	2438	T04 R17 WELS	190	S							
ST JOHN P(LOWER 1ST)	2428	T04 R17 WELS	29								
ST JOHN P(UPPER 1ST)	2440	T04 R17 WELS	30								
STRATTON P	0618	RAINBOW TWP	15	S							

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6

Remote ponds¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	E	RESOURCE RATINGS ³					
					W	SC	SH	B	C	P
SUNDAY P	3316	MAGALLOWAY PLT	30	S	S					
SWIFT RIVER P (LIT)	3572	TOWNSHIP E	15	O	-					
TILDEN P	4418	T10 SD	36	S						
TOBEY P #1	2674	T05 R07 BKP WKR	35	m		O	S			
TOBEY P #2	2676	T05 R07 BKP WKR	32	m		S				
TOBEY P #3	2678	T05 R07 BKP WKR	14	m		S	S			
TROUT L	1098	KOSSUTH TWP	5							
TROUT P	5082	LOWELLTOWN TWP	55	m				-		
TROUT P	3260	MASON TWP	17	m		S		O		
TROUT P	0792	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	20	S						
TUMBLEDOWN DICK P	0548	T01 R11 WELS	24	m						
TUMBLEDOWN P	3512	TOWNSHIP 6 N OF WELD	9	-						
TURTLE P	0952	LAKE VIEW PLT	81	O		-	-			
TWIN (TROUT) PONDS	2102	T02 R09 WELS	60	O		O	S			
TWO MILE P	9765	T16 R13 WELS	12	m						
UNNAMED P	7115	COMSTOCK TWP	15	m						
UNNAMED P	9748	ATTEAN TWP	12	m						
UNNAMED P	8934	ATTEAN TWP	5							
UNNAMED P	8416	COMSTOCK TWP	20	m						
UNNAMED P	8900	T05 R07 BKP WKR	10	m						
UNNAMED P	8942	HOLEB TWP	2	-						
UNNAMED P	8868	PARLIN POND TWP	7							
UNNAMED P	7073	T06 R15 WELS	8	-						
WADLEIGH P (LITTLE)	2974	T08 R15 WELS	15	m	-					
WELMAN P (UPPER)	2482	PRENTISS TWP	45	S	-					
WING P	2319	SKINNER TWP	10							
WOODMAN P	0622	RAINBOW TWP	6							
WOUNDED DEER P*	2484	PRENTISS TWP	12							

¹CRITERIA: not accessible within 1/2 mile by 2wd; no more than 1 non-commercial remote camp; cold water game fishery.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

*Identified and zoned as a remote pond in 1990.

STATISTICS:

NUMBER:	177 lakes	% OF TOTAL	5.9%
ACRES:	5689 ac total (avg 32)		.8%
SHOREFRONT:	942,506 ft total (avg 5325)		2.7%

MANAGEMENT CLASS 7

Management Class 7 includes all lakes not otherwise designated herein.

Appendix D

LURC Permitting Statistics

LURC PERMIT ACTIONS 1982 - 1995														
	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
BP	202	279	273	335	403	585	587	834	900	618	691	621	615	659
DP	47	53	79	75	84	88	67	109	95	110	122	98	89	102
SP	7	7	12	9	16	18	19	36	31	33	29	16	15	11
ZP	20	25	25	14	20	22	25	33	28	34	39	29	25	13
FOP	51	41	40	36	24	16	6	8	20	14	9	11	9	8
GP	20	20	20	33	27	43	42	71	50	59	34	37	34	22
ULP	108	16	34	56	78	20	20	33	27	21	18	21	19	17
RP	8	12	12	11	6	8	9	13	12	7	5	8	5	7
BCP	6	19	21	16	7	13	8	10	20	7	5	4	7	4
WL	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	6	9	2	3	6
SA	7	8	4	3	3	12	8	8	7	7	9	12	12	9
HP	0	0	2	2	4	8	3	0	2	2	4	3	3	1
LDP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	6	7
NOTE: This table shows total permit actions taken by LURC (approvals and denials). Since these figures include administrative actions and amendments to permits, the number of permit actions taken does not necessarily represent the number of new projects or activities occurring in a given year.														

BP -Building Permit

DP -Development Permit

SP -Subdivision Permit

ZP - Rezoning Petition

FOP - Forestry Operations Permit

GP -Great Ponds Permit

ULP - Utility Line Permit

RP - Road Permit

BCP -Bridge Construction Permit

WL -Wetlands Permit

SA -Stream Alteration Permit

HP -Hydropower Permit

LDP -Land Division Permit

NEW DWELLINGS APPROVED IN LURC JURISDICTION											
1985 - 1995											
	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
New dwellings	248	308	397	413	517	536	305	320	293	253	321
New dwellings on lakes	102	103	139	121	198	218	118	97	96	101	136

REGULATED SUBDIVISION ACTIVITY IN LURC JURISDICTION (Approved Projects involving new land divisions) 1982 - 1995														
	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
No. of subdivisions	2	2	8	7	9	8	13	21	14	13	16	3	4	4
Total acres affected	16	12	247	117	496	270	511	497	380	508	443	269	46	77
Total lots created	12	7	62	74	96	78	166	153	90	94	145	37	18	29
Total condos	0	0	0	36	0	28	52	12	7	30	0	0	0	0
Note: These figures do not include large-lot subdivisions which are statutorily exempt from LURC regulations or were processed under Chapter 16 of the Commission's regulations														

Appendix E

Land Use Regulation Commission's Policies Concerning Deeryard Issues

Twice, the Commission has comprehensively reviewed and discussed its deer wintering area program in response to specific concerns and changes affecting the program. No other aspect of the Commission's programs has elicited such singular attention over the years, a measure of the value of the affected resources to all parties.

The first review, undertaken in 1981, resulted in a document which set forth the Commission's policies regarding a number of issues associated with the deeryard zoning program. The second review was initiated in 1988. It resulted in a policy document addressing a number of issues and several rule changes.

The findings of these two reviews have been integrated and updated and are presented below.

The Taking Issue

In 1980, the Commission's deer wintering area zoning program was constitutionally challenged in court. After examining all of the constitutional issues involved, the Maine Supreme Judicial Court upheld the concept of using zoning to protect wildlife populations and the Commission's deer wintering area zoning in particular.

Burden on Landowners

The Commission's review of the deeryard program included extensive consideration of whether restrictions on the level of activity permitted in P-FW zones create an undue burden for landowners. The Commission recognizes that the harvesting of trees within P-FW Subdistricts carries higher administrative and operating costs than comparable operations in M-GN zones, and that removal restrictions limit the short-term return from these areas. Nevertheless, it finds that deer and timber management are not mutually exclusive and that these costs are neither excessive nor unjustified. The Commission acknowledges that many deeryards do not represent ideal situations with respect to management many are even-aged, over-mature, or both. But productive timber management in deeryards is possible with proper planning. Unfortunately, many landowners have not availed themselves of the various options provided by the deeryard program, such as harvesting by plan agreement, harvesting by LURC permit, or harvesting under a long-range management plan.

Not finding existing management options inflexible or overly limiting, the Commission does not consider zoning additional acreage unduly burdensome. Nonetheless, it recognizes that there are bound to be cases in which harvesting in excess of I&FW guidelines is justified based on special site conditions or other factors. It encourages landowners to utilize the permitting process to seek approval for harvesting in these cases.

The Commission recognizes the special economic hardships which, under particular circumstances, may be caused by rigid adherence to deer yard zoning criteria and cutting prescriptions, particularly for the small landowner. Accordingly, the Commission accepts that it has an important role to play in striking a reasonable balance between the needs of deer and the needs of landowners. In seeking to strike that balance in a fair way, the Commission will exercise care to prevent any landowner from being unduly burdened for the protection of the deer resource.

The Commission will be responsive to concerns expressed about undue economic hardship and will determine, on a case by case basis, whether a particular deer yard zone is necessary and reasonable in terms of its benefits to the public as against its economic or other burdens on the landowner. Thus, in cases where an unfair or unreasonable burden on a landowner is shown, the Commission will reconsider and, where appropriate, remove all or part of the deer yard zoning.

Having considered a variety of other approaches to responding to potential economic hardship issues caused by deer yard zoning, the Commission believes this case-by-case weighing process is the only one which allows for reasonable flexibility and responsiveness where needed without creating arbitrary and rigid rules for responding to economic hardship problems. In sum, the Commission believes that making the process more flexible and less rigid, rather than the opposite, is the proper response to this concern. This response, coupled with the other policies articulated below, should provide a fair deer yard program without imposing unreasonable economic hardships on landowners.

The Budworm Problem

The budworm outbreak of the 1970's and early 1980's created a conflict between the public's desire to protect important resources such as deer yards and the landowner's legitimate interest in salvaging budworm infested timber. This conflict was particularly acute because areas which comprise the best deer shelter tend to be composed of dense, even-aged over-mature spruce and fir, the very forest components which are most susceptible to budworm. The Commission decided that it will not require the protection of deer cover which is composed of stands of dead or dying trees, even though these may be of some continuing benefit in protecting deer. In most such instances, the Commission will allow cutting of deer shelter areas. However, in cases where dead and dying trees are a relatively small component of a stand which otherwise is reasonably healthy, the Commission may decide to restrict harvesting so as to avoid destruction of the value of the residual stand as deer shelter.

Administrative Burdens in Managing Deer Yards

There have been isolated instances where landowners have complained of significant costs and delays in awaiting approvals for cutting in deer yards. In response, the Commission streamlined its administrative processes and relies upon the wildlife biologists of the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife to work out an acceptable cutting agreement in the field with the landowner in a timely manner. If landowners experience administrative problems or delays with this system, the Commission or its staff should be so informed immediately so that efforts may be made promptly to expedite the process.

Deer Yard Zoning Criteria

The criteria used by LURC to identify deer yards have been the subject of much discussion but little criticism. The only significant criticism has been that, in focusing on protection of currently used deer yards, the Commission has not provided for the identification and protection of deer yard needs 10 to 20 years into the future. However, extending the program to cover "prospective" deer yards would be speculative and impractical. Moreover, experts indicate that deer tend to yard up in the same areas year after year. Accordingly, the Commission's program will remain focused on currently used and needed deer yards, while recognizing that, if circumstances change and deer alter their yarding habits over time, the Commission should remain flexible in altering deer yard zones accordingly.

In 1990, the Commission added a number of informational requirements to the criteria for applying protective zoning to proposed deeryards. The additional information is used to provide a broader context in which to consider individual rezoning proposals — to enable a determination that the new zone is necessary and thus more appropriate than the current zone.

The Commission also considered whether other issues should be addressed in the rezoning criteria. Landowners feel that the economic and management impacts of deeryard rezoning proposals should be reflected directly in the rezoning criteria. The Commission recognizes the costs associated with its regulation of deeryard zones. It also recognizes the costs associated with unregulated use of resources. In the case of deeryards, these would include the decline in deer population caused by the unrestricted harvesting of deeryards and economic losses associated with the decline in passive and active recreation revolving around deer. Rather than evaluate costs to the landowner against costs to society on a case-by-case basis as part of each rezoning application, the Commission has factored these considerations into the standards governing activities in deeryards which allow continuing timber management of deeryards.

The Commission believes this is the appropriate approach to economic considerations, excepting perhaps cases involving protection zoning which encompasses most of a small ownership, for two reasons. First, the determination of what constitutes an unacceptable economic burden is a very complex, and somewhat subjective, calculation. Second, the Commission had difficulty envisioning a case in which unre-

stricted timber management could justifiably override deer management, thus it anticipated denying a rezoning proposal on that basis only as a rare exception to the rule.

The Commission also contemplated whether to incorporate consideration of the impact of deeryard rezonings on the wood supply in the rezoning criteria. It resolved that establishment of a limit on the amount of land that can be included within the P-FW Subdistrict in LURC jurisdiction was the most appropriate means of addressing this issue. This limit and the details of its application are described later in this document.

Deeryard Cutting Prescription Criteria

The cutting prescriptions for deer yards, as provided under the guidelines of the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (IF&W), generally appear to allow for a reasonable degree of cutting on a sustained yield basis balanced with a reasonable degree of long term deer yard protection. In the past, however, there has been some confusion regarding how the cutting prescriptions are arrived at. In response to the Commission's request, IF&W has developed and made available written guidelines regarding management of deer wintering areas which are the basis for developing cutting prescriptions.

Future Study Needs

The Commission wishes to encourage studies by IF&W and others on the effects on the deer herd of various deer yard management techniques, including alternative cutting prescriptions. The Commission recognizes that such studies will necessarily take a number of years and require a long term commitment. As such studies get underway and yield results, the Commission wishes to be informed of their progress.

The Commission also encourages additional studies by IF&W to identify other wildlife values of deer yards as well as other significant wildlife and fishery habitats appropriate for P-FW zoning protection.

Deeryard Rezoning Process

In 1990, the Commission made some changes to the deeryard rezoning process. These changes were designed to promote cooperation and coordination between IF&W and the landowner, while providing equal opportunities for evaluation of the suitability of an area for deeryard zoning. Landowners are either given the opportunity to attend IF&W's ground survey of an area under consideration as a deeryard, or they are granted the right to petition the Commission for reconsideration of a deeryard rezoning if they have information suggesting that zone criteria were not met. This approach is designed to give landowners equal opportunity to evaluate the scientific basis for the proposed zone, and minimize factual disputes by promoting exploration of an area by both parties at the same time.

Scope of the Deeryard Rezoning Program

Landowner concerns with the deeryard program have focused on the rezoning of land from Management Districts to Protection Subdistricts. These concerns were precipitated in large part by the addition of considerable new acreage to the deeryard program in the latter part of the 1980's. IF&W believes that additional deeryards are needed to support the deer population in LURC jurisdiction. The discovery and documentation of new deeryards by IF&W support this contention. The Commission believes that an increase in the acreage of zoned deeryards is justified. Deer are valued highly by people in this state and their wintering habitat should be provided a reasonable level of protection. At the same time, given the uncertainties associated with a species living at the northern edge of its range and the need to reasonably consider other needs, such as the wood supply provided by these areas, the Commission is persuaded to define the scope of the deeryard protection program by establishing that zoned deeryard acreage shall not exceed 3.5% of each Deer Management District. A 3.5% cap allows for considerable, but not unlimited, expansion of the program.

The Commission recognizes that the 3.5% cap does not reflect IF&W's estimate that 5% of the land-base will be used for winter shelter by the target deer population. Nevertheless, the Commission's mandate is different from IF&W's, and directs it to provide for the multiple use of resources in its jurisdiction. The cap reflects the Commission's feeling that protection of deeryard acreage to a level of 3.5% most appropriately balances competing uses of a highly valued land resource. If the limit is reached in a particular Deer

Management District, the rezoning process will focus on replacing lower priority deeryards with higher priority deeryards.

Permanence of P-FW Zones

In 1990, the Commission established a clearer process for reviewing the status of deeryards that are believed to be no longer used by deer. It felt the standard for removal should be strict because the deer-yard program is designed to be a long-term habitat protection program, but recognized that removal of land from the P-FW designation is appropriate in some cases. Therefore, the removal criteria specify that a deer-yard must not have been used by deer for ten years to qualify for removal. If this criteria is met, IF&W and the landowner will be given the opportunity to present cases to the Commission regarding the appropriateness of retaining P-FW zoning, and the Commission will make the final decision. Alternatively, a deer-yard zone may be removed without extensive documentation of no use if both IF&W and the landowner agree that removal of land from the P-FW designation is appropriate.

Appendix F

Plantations in the Jurisdiction

Aroostook County

Cary Plt.
Cyr Plantation
Garfield Plt.
Glenwood Plt.
Macwahoc Plt
Moro Plt.
Nashville Plt.
Oxbow Plt.
Reed Plt.
St. John Plt.
Winterville Plt.

Franklin County

Coplin Plt.
Dallas Plt.
Rangeley Plt.
Sandy River Plt.

Knox County

Matinicus Island Plt

Lincoln County

Monhegan Plt.

Oxford County

Lincoln Plt.
Magalloway Plt

Penobscot County

Carroll Plt.
Drew Plt.
Seboeis Plt.
Webster Plt.

Piscataquis County

Kingsbury Plt.
Lake View Plt.

Somerset County

Dennistown Plt.
Highland Plt.
Pleasant Ridge Plt
The Forks Plt.
West Forks Plt.

Washington County

Codyville Plt.
Grand Lake Str. Plt.

Towns in the Jurisdiction

Aroostook County

Caswell
Hamlin
Hammond

Hancock County

Osborn

Penobscot County

Lakeville
Mount Chase

Piscataquis County

Beaver Cove

Washington County

Baring

Appendix G

Fastest Growing Communities in LURC Jurisdiction, 1971-91

		<i>Permits Issued for New Dwellings</i>	<i>County</i>
1.	Rangeley Plt.	297	Franklin
2.	Dallas Plt.	181	Franklin
3.	Lakeville	172	Penobscot
4.	Beaver Cove	148	Piscataquis
5.	Mount Chase	119	Penobscot
6.	Albany Twp.	117	Oxford
7.	Freeman Twp.	112	Franklin
8.	Connor Twp.	106	Aroostook
9.	Trescott Twp.	97	Washington
10.	Sandy River Plantation	87	Franklin
11.	T1 R9 WELS	85	Piscataquis
12.	Salem Twp.	83	Franklin
13.	T28 MD BPP	78	Hancock
14.	Lexington Twp.	77	Somerset
15.	Rockwood Strip (T2 R1)	73	Somerset
16.	Indian Purchase #4	68	Penobscot
17.	Orneville Twp.	64	Piscataquis
18.	Cary Plt.	62	Aroostook
19.	Winterville Plt.	62	Aroostook
20.	Coplin Plt.	56	Franklin
21.	Tomhegan Twp.	56	Somerset
22.	Osborn	55	Hancock
23.	Elliotsville Twp.	55	Piscataquis
24.	Edmunds Twp	54	Washington
25.	Caswell	52	Aroostook
26.	T41 MD BPP	52	Hancock
27.	Wyman Twp.	50	Franklin
28.	Concord Twp.	48	Somerset
29.	Argyle Twp.	47	Penobscot
30.	Prentiss Twp.	47	Penobscot

Appendix H

Sources

Agricultural Resources

- Davis, Clayton. 12/21/92. (Dept. of Agriculture, Division of Regulations.)
Dept. of Agriculture, Division of Regulation. 1991 list of maple syrup processors.
Harker, John. 12/16/92. Personal communication. (Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Marketing.)
Libby, Russell. 12/16/92. Personal communication. (Dept. of Agriculture, Division of Research, Division of Regulation.)
Pennell, Nate. 12/16/92. Personal communication. (Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District.)
Roble, Keith. 12/16/92. Personal communication. (Central Aroostook Soil and Water Conservation District.)

Air Resources

- Fernandez, Ivan. 1993. Personal communication, 02/17/93.
Fernandez, Ivan J. 1986. "Air Pollution: Synthesis of the Role of Major Air Pollutants in Determining Forest Health and Productivity" In *Stress Physiology and Forest Productivity*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Hingham, MA.
Fernandez, Ivan J. 1991. "Effects of Acidic Precipitation on Soil Productivity" In Adriano, D.C. and A.H. Johnson, eds. *Acidic Precipitation*, Springer-Verlag. New York.
Haines, Terry. 1993. Personal communication, 03/29/93.
Kahl, Jeffrey S. et al. 1991. "Maine" In Charles, Donald F., ed., *Acid Deposition and Aquatic Ecosystems: Regional Case Studies*. Springer-Verlag. New York.
Kahl, Steve. 1993. Personal communication, 01/08/93.
Maine Department of Environmental Protection. 1991. *Annual Report on Air Quality, 1991*.
Mower, Barry. 1993. Personal communication, 05/10/93.
Ryan, J. 1991. *Mercury in the Environment and the Implications for Brook Trout (Salvinus fontinalis)*. University of Maine, Orono, ME, cited in Haines, 1993, Personal communication.

Coastal Resources

- Conkling, Philip W., *Islands in Time*, 1981.
Conkling, Philip W., *Seeing the Forest for the Trees: Island Forestry*, The Island Journal.
Fox, William T., *At the Sea's Edge*, 1983.
LURC island files.
Maine Land Use Regulation Commission, 1976. *A Preliminary Study of the Coastal Islands in the Land Use Regulation Commission's Jurisdiction*.
Maine Land Use Regulation Commission, 1991. *Monhegan Island Plantation: An Inventory and Analysis*.

Cultural, Archaeological and Historical Resources

- Land Use Regulation Commission, Maine Department of Conservation. August 1986. *Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment Work Plan*.
Maine Historic Preservation Commission. January 1991. *Susquehanna Tradition Context*. Nomination Version.

- Spiess, Arthur E. May 1991. Ceramic Period Context.
 _____ June 1991. Early Contact Period Context.
 _____ May 1991. Early and Middle Archaic Context Draft.
 _____ February 1992. Lauentian Context Draft.
 _____ 1992. Maine Prehistoric Archaeological Sites: Introduction and Management. Maine Historic Preservation Commission.
 Wilson, Deborah and Arthur Spiess. 1990. Study Unit I: Fluted Point Paleoindian. In *The Maine Archaeological Society Bulletin*. 30:1:15-31.

Energy Resources

- Commission on Comprehensive Energy Planning. May, 1992. Final Report.
 Connors, Jim. March, 1992. "The Biomass Energy Industry in Maine" in *Biologue*.
 Elder, Betsy. State Planning Office. 03/13/95. Personal communication.

Forest Resources

- Appalachian Mountain Club, etc., 1993. An Inventory and Ranking of the Key Resources of the Northern Forest Lands of Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine.
 Bureau of Taxation records of property ownership in unorganized townships.
 Department of Conservation, 1988. *Forest for the Future*, Department of Conservation, January 1988.
 Irland, Lloyd, 1992. "The Outlook for Maine's Wood-Using Industries" in *Maine Business Indicators*, Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Southern Maine, Spring, 1992.
 Irland, Lloyd, 1991. "Challenges for the North Maine Woods" in *Maine Policy Review*.
 Maine Forest Service, 1990. 1990 Silvicultural Activities Report. Forest Information Center, Maine Forest Service.
 Maine Forest Service, 1991. Silvicultural Activities Report, Forest Information Center, Maine Forest Service, 1991.
 Maine Forest Service, 1993. Assessment of Maine's Wood Supply.
 Land & Water Associates, 1994. "Impacts of Changes in Landownership Patterns and Development in the LURC Jurisdiction on Timber Production and the State's Forest Manufacturing Economy." Prepared for the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission.
 Maine Tomorrow, 1991. Small Woodland Owners in Maine: An Analysis of Trends. (Prepared for the Small Woodland Owners Association of Maine)
 Northeastern Forest Alliance, 1993. The Economic Importance of Maine's Forest.
 USDA Forest Service, 1990. *Northern Forest Lands Study*, USDA Forest Service and Governor's Task Force on Northern Forest Lands, April, 1990.
 USDA Forest Service, 1984. *Forest Statistics for Maine*, 1971 and 1982, USDA Forest Service, Northeast Station, 1984.
 University of Maine Cooperative Extension Service, 1987. The Forests of Maine: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow.
 Northern Forest Lands Council. 1994. Finding Common Ground: Conserving the Northern Forest

Geologic and Mountain Resources

- Hasbrouck, Sherman. 1982. Mining in Maine. Land and Water Resources Center, UMO. Orono, Maine
 Jorgensen, Neil. 1977. A Guide to New England's Landscape. The Globe Pequot Press. Chester, Connecticut.
 Kendall, David L. 1987. Glaciers and Granite: A Guide to Maine's Landscape and Geology. Down East Books. Camden, Maine.
 Loiselle, Marc and Woodrow B. Thompson. 1987. The Geology of Maine In *Rocks and Minerals*, Nov/Dec. 1987, Vol. 62, Number 6
 New England Governors' Conference, Inc. 1992. Construction Aggregates Demand in the New England States.
 New England Governors' Conference, Inc. 1993. Construction Aggregates Supply in the New England States.

Recreational Resources

- Arlen, Alice, *In the Maine Woods: The Insider's Guide to Traditional Maine Sporting Camps*, 1994.
- Brown, Tommy, *Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Studies Applied to the Northern Forest Lands: Literature Review and Analysis*, 1993.
- Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Recreation, *Statewide Outdoor Recreation Plan*, 1988.
- Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Recreation, *Maine Outdoor Recreation Activity Participation and Trends*, June, 1994.
- Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Recreation, *Maine 1992 Household Survey Results*, November, 1992.
- Irland, Lloyd C., *Outdoor Recreation Supply in the Maine Woods: Issues for the Future*, 1st Annual Munsugun Conference Proceedings.
- Northern Forest Land Council, *Findings and Options*, 1993.

Special Natural Areas

- Brimson, Mark M., "Changes in the Functioning of Wetlands Along Environmental Gradients," *Wetlands*, Vol. 13, No. 2, Special Issue, June 1993, pp. 65-74. Davis, Ronald B., George L. Jacobson, Jr., Lissa S. Widoff, Amy Zlotzky, "Evaluation of Maine Peatlands for their Unique and Exemplary Qualities," Institute for Quaternary Studies and Department of Botany & Plant Pathology, University of Maine at Orono, May 1983.
- Dennison, Mark S. and Berry, James F., *Wetlands, Guide to Science, Law and Technology*, Noyes Publications, 1993.
- Gibbs, James P., "Importance of Small Wetlands for the Persistence of Local Populations of Wetland-Associated Animals," *Wetlands*, Vol. 13, No. 1, March 1993, pp. 25-31.
- Kusler, Jon A., William J. Mitsch, Joseph S. Larson, "Wetlands," *Scientific American*, January 1994, pp. 50-56.
- Maine Natural Heritage Program. 1991. *Natural Landscapes of Maine: a Classification of Ecosystems and Natural Communities*. Maine Department of Economic and Community Development, State House Station 130, Augusta, Maine 04333. 77 pp.
- Nichols, C. 1994. Map Accuracy of National Wetlands Inventory Maps for Areas Subject to Land Use Regulation Commission Jurisdiction. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hadley, MA. Ecological Services report R5-94/6. 14 pp.
- Rolband, Michael S., "National Wetland Inventory Maps versus Field Delineated Wetlands Under the 1987 Manual," *Wetland Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 1, Winter 1995, pp. 10-14.
- Tiner, Ralph W., *Maine Wetlands and Their Boundaries*, Maine Department of Economic and Community Development - Office of Comprehensive Planning, June 1991.
- Widoff, Lissa S., *Maine Wetlands Priority Plan*, Maine Bureau of Parks and Recreation, Maine State Planning Office, Land & Water Resources Council, July 1988.
- Worley, Ian A., *Maine Peatlands*, Maine State Planning Office, September 1981.

Wildlife and Fisheries Resources

- Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. 1992. Wildlife Division: Research and Management Report.
- Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. 1994. Letter of 10/24/94 from Ray B. Owen, Commissioner to Fred Todd.
- Fenderson, Owen. 1995. Personal communication.
- Land Use Regulation Commission. 1983. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan*.
- Land Use Regulation Commission. 1991. Policy Statement on Deer Wintering Areas. June 20, 1991.

Development

- Bureau of Taxation records of property ownership in unorganized areas.
- Irland, Lloyd, "Challenges for the North Maine Woods," *Maine Policy Review*, 1992.

- Land & Water Associates, *Trends in New Residential Development in Maine's Unorganized Areas — Amount and Location of New Residences by Region and Minor Civil Division*, 1993.
- Land & Water Associates, *Location of New Development in the Wildlands: Where Residential, Commercial and Industrial Development has occurred in Relationship to Roads, Waterbodies and Mountains*, 1993.
- Land & Water Associates, *Historical Demand for Development in the Wildlands: A Characterization of LURC Permit Recipients by Type, Resident State, and Maine County of Origin*, 1993.
- Land & Water Associates, *Impacts of Development on the Traditional Character and Recreational Uses of the LURC Jurisdiction*, 1994.
- Land Use Regulation Commission. Permit and Geo files.
- Market Decisions Inc., *Land Use Regulation Commission Profile and Projections*, 1993.
- Northern Forest Lands Council. *Finding Common Ground: Conserving the Northern Forest*, 1994.
- U.S. Census, Selected publications from 1970, 1980 and 1990.

Non-Discrimination Notice

The Department of Conservation (DOC) does not discriminate on the basis of disability, race, color, creed, gender, age, or national origin, in admission to, access to, or operations of its programs, services, or activities, or its hiring or employment practices. This notice is provided as required by Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and the Maine Human Rights Act. Questions, concerns, complaints, or requests for additional information regarding the ADA may be forwarded to DOC's ADA Compliance/EEO Coordinator, State House Station #22, Augusta, Maine 04333, 207-287-2211 (V), 207-287-2213 (TTY). Individuals who need auxiliary aids for effective communication in program and services of DOC are invited to make their needs and preferences known to the ADA Compliance/EEO Coordinator.

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333

